C.R. #222385

DATE OF REPORT (DAY-MO.-YEAR)

4 Jan 96

To be used in all cases that are to be classified as either EXONERATED, UNFOUNDED, NOT SUSTAINED, or in SUSTAINED cases where the Disciplinary Recommendation does not exceed FIVE (5) DAYS SUSPENSION.

SUBMIT ORIGINAL AND 3 COPIES IF ASSIGNED TO SAME UNIT AS ACCUSED. SUBMIT ORIGINAL AND 4 COPIES IF NOT ASSIGNED TO SAME UNIT AS ACCUSED.

TO: SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

ATTENTION ☐ ADMINISTRATOR IN CHARGE, OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

☑ ASSISTANT DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

FROM-INVESTIGATOR'S NAME		RANK	STAR NO.	SOCIAL SEC. NO.	EMPLOY	EE NO.	JNIT ASSIGN
McGOVERN, James F.		Sgt.	1832				013
ADDRESS OF INCIDENT			DATE OF INC	IDENT - TIME	BEATO	FINCIDENT	LOCATION CODE
1626 W. Huron			5 Nov 95	0100 k	rs. 13	324	02
NAME			STAR NO.	SOCIAL SEC. NO.	EMPLOY	EE NO.	JNIT ASSIGN
1. CHABRON, Renata A.			5714				013
2. KUSSMANN, Gary	M.	P.O.	6273			1	013
SEX/RACE D.O.B. 1. F/W 65	DATE OF APPOINTM		DUTY STATUS	S (TIME OF INCIDEN Y OFF DUT		ORN :	ODET 01
2. M/W 56	5 Dec 88		₩ ои руг	Y DOFF DUT	Y SWO	ORN ILIAN	01
1. D	CHARGES	N		-	A	IN & DATE	
2. D		N		*_	A		
NAME	*ADDRESS**		CITY STA	TE TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE M/WH	D.O.B./AGE	/40 PHYS.
NAME VANE					e ^{al}	-	
NAME DNA	ADDRESS**		CITY STA	TE TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE	D.O.B./AGE	PHYS. COND. CODET
DNA	91		8	_			
NAME	ADDRESS**		CITY STA	TE TELEPHONE	SEX/RACE F/WH	D O B (AGE	/50 ODE 1 0
NAME SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE S							

🛚 SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL ACCUSED, COMPLAINANTS, VICTIMS, WITNESSES.

On 7 Nov 95 at 1200 hours, the complainant, telephoned the Office of Professional Standards and spoke to Inv. Maira Velez, Employee allege that on 5 Nov 95 at approximately 0100 hours, the accused officers, while at his tavern at 1626 W. Huron:

Allegation #1: threatened to close down his business, and

Allegation #2: entered the tavern without permission and searched his customers

without a warrant or permission.

I.A.D. LOCATION CODES*				I.A.D. PHYSICAL CONDITION CODEST		
01	Food Sales/Restaurant	11	Public Transportation Veh./Facility	01	No Visible Injury - Apparently Normal	
02	Tavern/Liquor Store	12	Park District Property	02	No Visible Injury - Under Influence	
)3	Other Business Establishment	13	Airport	03	Injured, Not Hospitalized	
)4	Police Building	14	Public Property - Other	04	Injured, Not Hospitalized - Under Influence	
)5	Lockup Facility	15	Other Private Premise	05	Injured, Hospitalized	
)6	Police Maintenance Facility	16	Expressway/Interstate System	06	Injured, Hospitalized - Under Influence	
7	CPD Automotive Pound Facility	17	Public Way - Other	07	Injured, Refused Medical Ald	
8 (Other Police Property	18	Waterway, Incl. Park District	08	Injured, Refused Medical Ald - Under Influenc	
9	Police Communications System	19	Private Residence .	09	Deceased	
.0	Court Room			10	Deceased - Under Influence	

* * IF CPD MEMBER, LIST RANK, STAR, SOCIAL SECURITY, EMPLOYEE NOS. IN ADDRESS BOX, PAX/BELL IN TELEPHONE BOX-

Briefly summarize the investigation describing your efforts to prove or disprove the allegation(s). Indicate whether witnesses or evidence

gun and subsequently resulted in the arrest of three subjects for narcotic violations. The premise involved is currently a validly licensed tavern, open for business, and the office did not need a warrant to enter or, for their safety, to conduct a protective search of pe sons they believe to be possibly armed. The r/s received conflicting information, from the complainant and witness, regarding the officers' threat to close down the tavern, a threat that all the officers deny. As a result, the r/s makes the following finding regarding the allegations: Allegation #1: the threat to close down the tavern: Not Sustained: in-

sufficient evidence either to prove or disprove the allegation, and,

Allegation #2: the entry and search: Exonerated: the incident occurred but the actions were lawful and proper.

MAN 2 6 1996

RECOMMENDATIONS: No disciplinary action.

15 Nov 95 (DATE COMPLETED DATE INITIATED (DATE COMPLAINT WAS RECEIVED FOR INVESTIGATION)

4 Jan 96

ELAPSED TIME (TOTAL TIME, EXPRESSED IN DAYS) 50 days.

Investigator will initiate the Command Channel Review form by completing the Investigator's Section.

support or do not support the allegation(s).



Additional Accused:

#3: LOPEZ, Rafael Z. P.O. Star #15827 S.S.

Employee Unit 013 M/WH/D.O.B.: 62

Date of Appt.: 18 Nov 91 On duty sworn member.

#4: RONAN, Sean M. P.O. Star #14396 S.S. # Employee : Unit 013 M/W/D.O.B.: 70 Date of Appt.: 22 Nov 93 On duty sworn member.

#5: MATIAS, Hector L. P.O. Star #9350 S.S. # Employee # Unit 013 M/WH/D.O.B.: 69
Date of Appt.: 18 Nov 91 On duty sworn member.

#6: ROMERO, Hector J. Jr. P.O. Star #12242 S.S. # Employee : Unit 013 M/WH/D.O.B. 65
Date of Appt.: 27 Mar 91 On duty sworn member.

Continuation of Summary, from Page #1:

and in that alleged that the officers told that they were going to close down the tavern permanently when, stated that the officers only closed down the tavern upon the completion of their search on the date of this incident.

A review of district reports revealed that a Vice Case Report, R.D. #S708184 was completed relating to this incident (Attachment #2). The r/s identified the listed six accused officers from this case report.

The accused officers were given their Notification of Charges/Allegations, their Administrative Proceedings Rights, and their Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel formsets (Attachment #'s 5 to 22). The six accused officers all submitted a report regarding this investigation (Attachment #'s 23 to 28). A review of the case report and the officers' reports revealed the following. The officers assert that on 5 Nov 95 at approximately 0100 hours, they received information from a citizen that a male Hispanic with a gun was in the tavern at 1626 W. Huron. The officers all went to and entered the tavern at 1626 W. Huron. The officers conducted a protective search of all the male Hispanic patrons of the tavern that matched the description given but, no weapons were recovered. However, three of the subjects searched were in possession of narcotics, place under arrest, and subsequently charged accordingly. The officers deny that they threatened to close down the business and the officers were not in possession of any type of warrant.

